

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 7 March 2006. Responsive to the Office Action, Independent Claim 1 and Claim 6 have been amended to clarify the inventive method that forms the basis of the subject Patent Application. Furthermore, Claims 2-3 have been cancelled by this Amendment and Claim 4 was previously cancelled.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirosawa (U.S. Patent # 6,473,180). However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 5 and 7 are allowable and Claims 3, 6 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 2-3 therein. Thus, Claim 3 has effectively been placed in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1, and any intervening claims, Claim 2. Thus, Claim 1 should now be allowable. Furthermore, since Claims 6 and 8 are dependent upon an allowable base claim, Claim 1, they should no longer be objected to.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

/David I. Klein/

David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 2 June 2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being electronically transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit # 2877, on the date shown below.
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

/David I. Klein/
DAVID I. KLEIN

06/02/2006
Date